

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-12 and 17-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Tso (6,185,625) in view of Szymansky (6,557,029). While paragraph 3 of the outstanding Office Action indicates that the patent number for the Szymansky patent is 6,185,625, this seems to be clearly an error since this patent number is the same as that of Tso. Thus, it is assumed that the examiner meant to reference the Szymansky patent 6,557,029 and applicant responds accordingly.

The examiner has indicated that Tso fails to teach the limitation wherein the steps (claim 1) are performed in the radio communication terminal. For this teaching, the examiner replies Szymansky and states that Szymansky teaches performing the steps of transforming the objects in the wireless terminal for transmitting to the network. Claims 13-16 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Tso in view of Szymansky and further in view of Maslov (6,538,673).

The examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The disclosure of Szymansky is quite brief in relation to the handheld computer 100. Certainly, the handheld computer 100 transmits information in a wireless fashion to the wireless antenna 102 which is on the exchange floor which is subsequently transmitted through the exchange network 106 and exchange firewall 108 to an outside firm and to a "marketlook" information system server of the outside firm. The "marketlook" server 112 is shown in further detail in Szymansky's figure 2 and is seen to comprise an HTTP web server 208 which permits access to web clients 210-214. Through an EAN interface 204, the information input into the computer 100 may be fed to the marketlook server and through the HTTP server 208 to the various web clients.

In relation to performing any other recited limitations in claim 1 in the radio communication terminal (corresponding to the mobile hand-held computer 100) the Szymansky specification lacks any substantial detail. Certainly, input data such as appears after line 2 in column 3 may be input by a user utilizing a touch sensitive screen and a stylus. As stated in column 3, line 21, the information entered on the screen is converted by the central processing unit of the hand-held computer 100. However, the type of conversion is not stated. It would appear, however, that the screen input is converted to pixel data files which are then made available to be viewed by the web clients through the “marketlook” server as shown, for example, in figure 3.

Figure 3 of Szymansky is a screenshot of the web browser which displays the handwritten jottings of the person utilizing the hand-held computer 100. See column 4, lines 23-25 of Szymansky. Notably absent is any teaching within Szymansky of generating an expression style format for expressing the stored objects as specifically recited in applicant’s claim 1. Likewise, according to applicant’s independent claim 17, Szymansky does not disclose any expression style format generating means for generating an expression style format for expressing the objects stored in the first memory means.

According to the recitations of claim 1, the radio communication terminal performs at least three steps, namely, (1) storing a plurality of objects; (2) generating an expression style format for expressing the stored objects; and (3) storing the generated expression style format. While Szymansky may teach by implication the storing of a plurality of objects bases on the strokes input by the user utilizing the stylus, Szymansky goes into no further details. While one may imagine that Szymansky has some means to store the plurality of objects which are presented on the screen, Szymansky does not inherently have limitations (2) and (3) nor does Szymansky expressly disclose such limitations. Indeed, if Szymansky performed the limitations (2) and (3) as set forth above, it is likely that the “marketlook” information system server 112 would perform such functions since this server contains both an interface to the hand-held computers 100, a marketlook manager 206 and a database 202 in which the graphic files

representing the handwritten jottings and other information are stored. See column 4, lines 15-18. However, Szymansky simply is silent as to any teaching of limitations (2) and (3).

Applicant can find no motivation to combine the teachings of Tso and Szymansky in a manner to meet applicant's claims. Given the teachings of Tso, even combined with the teachings of Szymansky, it is not seen how one would be motivated to take the remote scaling server functions and the remote scaling server of Tso and move them into the computer of Szymansky. Indeed, it would appear that the memory size and processing power utilized by the server would not permit nor motivate one to move the processing functions taught by Tso into the wireless hand-held computer of Szymansky.

The Maslov patent applied to dependent claims 13-16 and 29-32 does not cure the defects of the teachings of the primary Tso and secondary Szymansky references.

In view of the arguments set forth above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The examiner is requested to acknowledge receipt of the certified copy of applicant's priority document filed together with the application on December 15, 2000.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3-23-04

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5407

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 26,257